

Serial No. **10/024,296**
Amdt. dated December 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

Docket No. **P-0302**

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 21-24 to further clarify the invention. Claims 3, 5-8 and 15-24 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,377,818 (Irube et al.). Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (APA). Claims 3, 5-8 and 15-20 have been allowed.

Response to Amendment

The Examiner states in item 5 of the "Response to the Amendment" portion of the Office Action that the Examiner notes that the origination continuation message is a message sent separately from an origination message that comprises a sub-address as defined by the standards noted in Applicants' specification page 11, paragraphs 42 and 43. Applicants point out that "sub-address" according to embodiments of the present invention is not limited by the standards. As noted in paragraph 43, the SA system may be embodied differently by different service companies.

Serial No. **10/024,296**
Amdt. dated December 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

Docket No. **P-0302**

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants' thank the Examiner for allowing claims 3, 5-8 and 15-20.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Irube et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 21, Applicants submit that Irube et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, means for determining whether a distinguishing function is set active in the terminal, the distinguishing function being capable of distinguishing a call. The Examiner asserts that Irube et al. discloses a distinguishing function being set active by the on/off switch that powers on the terminal in Irube as disclosed in col. 6, lines 30-45. However, as noted in Applicants' previously filed response, an on/off switch is not a distinguishing function, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, the on/off switch in Irube which powers on the terminal is not a distinguishing function capable of distinguishing a call, as recited in the claims of the present application. According to embodiments of the present invention, it is determined whether a distinguishing function is set

active in the terminal where the distinguishing function is capable of distinguishing a call (see, Applicants' specification, paragraph 31).

Regarding claims 22-23, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 21 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Irube et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 21-23 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irube et al. in view of APA. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and submit that claim 24 is dependent on independent claim 21 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 24 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. **10/024,296**
Amdt. dated December 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

Docket No. **P-0302**

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 3, 5-8 and 15-24 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 CLD/FDB:tlg

Date: December 19, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-241\107076.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610